



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

MF

6

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/483,277 01/13/00 KATZ

R 249/178 6646

EXAMINER

WM01/0410

RONALD A. KATZ TECHNOLOGY LICENSING, L.P.
9220 SUNSET BLVD., SUITE 315
LOS ANGELES CA 90069

W00.S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2643

DATE MAILED:

04/10/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/483,277

Applicant(s)

Katz

Examiner

Stella Woo

Group Art Unit

2643



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 16, 2001

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 22-46 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 22-46 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2643

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 22, 24-25, 27-28, 35, 40, 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Szlam et al. (USPN 4,797,911, hereinafter "Szlam") for the same reasons given in the last Office and repeated below.

Regarding claims 22, 25, 27-28, 35, Szlam discloses a voice-data control system comprising:

receiving means (ANI decoder 10a24; Fig. 5; col. 12, lines 29-39);

cue means (message player 10a9; col. 12, lines 22-28; col. 13, lines 2-22);

status means (trunk interface control unit 10a13; col. 14, lines 3-43) to selectively indicate responsive signals (via voice recognition module 10a32; col. 13, line 54 - col. 14, line 32) and caller number identification signals (via ANI decoder 10a24; col. 12, lines 35-39) wherein at least one of said responsive signals or at least a portion of said caller number identification signals can be seen as a digital control signal (controls subsequent operation, e.g. uploading customer information, opening new accounts, play next message, cancel/change orders (col. 12, lines 29-54; col. 13, lines 6-18), disconnect trunk, connect to available operator (col. 14, lines 13-18), a digital

Art Unit: 2643

data signal (account information; col. 13, lines 30-33; col. 14, lines 22-32), or both (caller number, DTMF or voice signal acts as a digital control signal which causes subsequent system operation and as a digital data signal as account information);

test means (calling telephone number data is tested to determine whether the caller is an existing client who can then place, change, or cancel orders without the use of an operator; col. 12, line 29 - col. 14, line 32);

control means (system controller 11);

means for storing audio signals (message recorder; col. 17, lines 27-46).

Regarding claims 24, 40, 44-46, Szlam discloses a voice-data control system comprising:

cue means (message player 10a9);

status means (trunk interface control unit 10a13);

memory means (mainframe 16);

means for addressing (data controller 15);

control means (system controller 11);

means for storing audio signals (message recorder; col. 17, lines 27-46);

interface processor (mainframe computer 16 which isolates callers with existing accounts; col. 12, lines 22-66).

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2643

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 23, 26, 29, 31-34, 36-39, 41, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szlam in view of Masson et al. (USPN 4,908,850, hereinafter "Masson") for the same reasons given in the last Office action and repeated below.

Szlam discloses a voice-data control system comprising:

cue means (message player 10a9);

status means (trunk interface control unit 10a13);

memory means (mainframe 16);

means for addressing (data controller 15; col. 12, line 22 - col. 13, line 42);

control means (system controller 11).

Szlam differs from claims 23, 26, 29, 31, 33-34, and 41 in that although it provides for storing audio signals (col. 17, lines 27-46), it does not specify reproducing caller audio data.

However, Masson teaches the desirability of reproducing stored caller audio in order to, for instance, verify shipping address (col. 3, line 60 - col. 4, line 8; col. 6, lines 22-24; col. 7, line 63 - col. 8, line 15; col. 9, lines 25-42). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill at the time of invention to incorporate such reproducing of stored caller audio data, as taught by Masson, within the ordering system of Szlam for the same purpose of allowing verification of previously stored audio data, such as shipping address.

Art Unit: 2643

Szlam differs from claims 32, 36-39, and 43 in that it does not provide for testing for the presence of stored audio signals. However, Masson provides for testing for the presence of audio signals since different prompts are given to callers depending upon whether or not the audio signals representing the shipping address have been stored (col. 7, line 45 - col. 8, line 15) such that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate such testing for stored audio signals, as taught by Masson, within the ordering system of Szlam in order to determine whether or not to prompt for audio signals. Masson also provides for generating and storing an acknowledgment number (purchase order number) and flags the presence of stored audio signals via a dropship flag (col. 7, lines 55-56; col. 8, lines 23-24).

5. Claims 30 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szlam in view of Masson, as applied to claims above, and further in view of Barger Jr. et al. (USPN 4,071,698, hereinafter "Barger") for the same reasons given in the last Office action and repeated below.

The combination of Szlam and Masson differs from the claims in that it does not specify testing for use limit. However, as taught by Barger (col. 11, lines 34-47), it is well known in the art to test caller data for limiting the number of uses by the caller such that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to modify the combination of Szlam and Masson by incorporating the use of such testing of call data signals in order to allow for the limiting of the number of system uses by callers.

Art Unit: 2643

6. Applicant's arguments filed January 16, 2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Szlam does not teach storing ANI signals and therefore does not satisfy the requirements of claim 22. The examiner disagrees. Nowhere does claim 22 recite the "storing" of ANI signals. Moreover, claims 22 recites alternative limitations, "wherein at least one of said responsive signals or at least a portion of said caller number identification signals can serve as a digital control signal, a digital data signal, or both" (lines 14-16) such that prior art satisfying just one of the alternative limitations satisfies the claim requirements.

Applicant further argues that Szlam's voice recognition module does not satisfy Applicant's recitation of a "status means." However, the examiner did not read applicant's "status means" on the voice recognition module of Szlam. As described in the last Office action (section numbered 2, lines 7+), and repeated in the present Office action, the examiner considered the trunk interface control unit 10a13 of Szlam (see Fig. 5) as the status means which indicates signals from ANI decoder 10a28, DTMF decoder 10a28, and voice recognition module 10a32. Szlam also teaches the use of a TeleRec system as the voice recognition module 10a32 which can recognize spoken words in addition to DTMF tones, thus, eliminating the need for a separate DTMF decoder 10a28 (col. 13, lines 57-66).

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2643

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks


Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-6306 or (703) 308-6296; (for formal communications, please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE"; and for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stella Woo whose telephone number is (703) 305-4395 and can normally be reached from 6:00 a.m. until 2:30 p.m., Monday through Friday.

April 9, 2001


STELLA WOO
PRIMARY EXAMINER